

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**  
**MARCH 21, 2006**

**1. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Julie Aitken, Vice-Chair Sam Engel, Jr., and Jeff Evans. Also present were Councilmember Michael Crowley, Planning and Zoning Manager Bruce Dell, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager Marcie Nolan, Planner David Abramson, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Bob Breslau was absent.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 7, 2006**

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve the minutes of February 7, 2006. In a voice vote, with Mr. Breslau being absent, all voted in favor. (Motion carried 4-0)

**3. SITE PLANS**

**3.1 SP 3-5-05, Rodeo Village, east of University Drive and south of Griffin Road (A-1 and R-10) (tabled from March 7, 2006)**

John Voigt and Jill Cohen, representing the petitioner, were present. Ms. Nolan updated the Committee on the issues and recommendations which were made at the previous meeting. She further noted what had and had not been accomplished.

Using renderings of old and modified site plans, Mr. Voigt specified the changes which had been made. He explained how moving the guest parking had increased the ratio of parking spaces; that a cobblestone feature was added to the entrance as a traffic calming device; that the first townhouse driveway was "flipped" in order to locate it further away from the entrance; that the island medians were to be composed of cobblestone humps instead of landscaping material which may impede vision; and that the detailed dimensions of the barn were included in their packets. Regarding the stairway in the townhouses, Mr. Voigt explained that the ceiling on the first floor was lowered in order to eliminate the problem. He also advised that the ten-foot garages had been widened to 11-feet, eight inches.

Chair Aitken indicated that she was pleased with the design and layout of the barn and paddock. Vice-Chair Engel advised that the barn doors should be no less than eight-feet tall. Mr. Voigt agreed that it would easily be corrected.

Mr. Evans disclosed that he had discussed a few items with the applicant and he reiterated what those items were. He first suggested that in order to keep headlights from shining in on the first three units nearest to University Drive, that the community wall be extended further north and south. Mr. Evans continued that if it was not allowed, then the units should be heavily landscaped to blanket the noise and headlights. He was also concerned that there might not be enough space for back patios on the units which backed up to the southern property line since the space may be designated for drainage. Ms. Cohen assured that the back patios could be managed and would be addressed at final engineering. Mr. Evans noted that the median islands with landscaping would be a nuisance, especially when backing out of driveways. He, therefore, made alternative suggestion of incorporating pavers and speed humps. Ms. Cohen understood his intention and agreed to address the issue with engineering and fire.

Mr. Evans pointed out a problem with the two end units involving the side-entry doors. Mr. Voigt agreed and indicated that French doors would be used at those locations. As Mr. Evans perceived a problem with the air conditioning units being located on the third floor, not accessible, and on a cantilevered structure, he recommended that they be put on the ground. He left it up to the builder as to how that may be accomplished although he suggested that they be located somehow on the back patios. Mr. Evans suggested that the balconies over the patios contain gutter systems and he explained the benefit. Lastly, Mr. Evans recommended that stucco be used for banding rather than foam molding as indicated.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**  
**MARCH 21, 2006**

Mr. Aucamp suggested that the Cocoplum hedge on the south property line behind the units be removed and that the Areca Palms remain. He also believed that it would be difficult to find 12-foot tall Cassia Suratsensis and suggested that they think of a substitute or if allowed, reduce the height to ten feet.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve based on the planning report and the following items: 1) that a wall be placed on University Drive, particularly at the rear of the two end buildings (If for some reason the wall is not allowed by another agency, at least double or triple the amount of landscaping for those two end units.); 2) that the rear patios would be part of the actual design of the buildings and they would not be removed; 3) the islands in the center of the roadway were to be changed to pavers and speed humps as per engineering design; 4) regarding the a/c units, the applicant would look at removing them from the upper third-floor balconies and lower them to grade; 5) the unit design that has the side entry front door, look at putting those on the front of the building with some sort of a cover towards the front; 6) add gutters to the upper balconies; 7) any banding should be stucco band, not foam; 8) remove the Cocoplum hedge at the south property line behind the buildings only; 9) raise the height of the barn in order to allow eight-foot tall barn doors; and 10) apply to Central Broward to vacate the 20-foot drainage easement on University Drive. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – absent; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

**3.2 MSP 7-4-05, Flamingo Village, 800 South Flamingo Road (AG) (tabled from March 7, 2006)**

Gus Khavanin, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson indicated that there had been three issues still in question; however, he noted that they may have been resolved subsequent to the issuance of the agenda. He listed the recommendations made at previous meetings and told of the progress in responding to those concerns.

Chair Aitken stated that the only change she observed was that the lake appeared to be smaller in order to allow for the back patios. She asked if the drainage requirements met Code now that the lake had been reduced. Mr. Abramson responded affirmatively. Mr. Engel pointed out that the first row of townhouses was moved ten-feet closer to University Drive in order to increase the space in the back for the patios. Mr. Khavanin confirmed that Mr. Engel was correct.

Mr. Evans questioned the note on the plans which indicated that there would not be access to SW 121 Avenue. Mr. Khavanin explained that although it appeared to be a dead end, the terrain was prepared for emergency access only. He pointed out where the “turn-around” access was for garbage trucks and Mr. Engel commented that it should be made larger. There was a brief discussion regarding the size of a hedge which would be placed to discourage vehicular access while allowing emergency vehicles to pass.

Mr. Khavanin spoke of the changes to the garages and the garage doors. Chair Aitken commented that the main issue which caused an impasse had not been resolved. She maintained that these were still Mediterranean-style townhouses which did not meet the intent of the rural lifestyle which the Town was trying to achieve on its most major rural scenic corridor. Mr. Khavanin contended that his client believed the site plan should be moved to Council for its opinion.

Chair Aitken specified that it was the purpose of the Committee to encourage development as was perceived by the Council and that was why the project was “stuck” at the Committee level. Mr. Evans asked Mr. Dell about a meeting between him and Mr. Khavanin last Thursday and if the Florida vernacular had been discussed. Mr. Dell responded that the discussion did not involve architecture, it had been about technical aspects and whether or not the project met Code.

Mr. Evans indicated that he thought the petitioner was going to look at designing this project in another vernacular, which he believed would not be too difficult to accomplish. He pointed out on sheet five, that the two-story end units needed some design creation to break up the flat wall.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**  
**MARCH 21, 2006**

Chair Aitken asked if a permit was necessary to dump fill on the property as she had noticed this was being done. Mr. Khavanin indicated that he had not been at the site for some time and was not aware that fill was being dumped on the site.

Mr. Evans stated that he still had an objection to there being no landscape buffer between the townhouses which backed up to each other around the "pond". Mr. Khavanin indicated that he was restricted by the Central Broward Water Control District on what could be planted in the drainage area. Pointing on Mr. Aucamp's plans, Mr. Khavanin indicated where the Cypress and Oak trees were intended to be placed. Mr. Aucamp was incredulous and suggested that they be placed on the slope of the bank. As Councilmember Crowley was present, he was asked what the regulations were regarding the situation. He responded that the rules and regulations of the District said that there was not to be any landscaping within drainage, canal or lake maintenance easements. Mr. Khavanin indicated that he would apply to the District for a variance to allow 15-feet instead of a 20-foot maintenance area which would then accommodate the trees. Councilmember Crowley responded that hopefully, those items would be addressed by the District before this project was presented to the Council.

Chair Aitken reminded the petitioner that this dilemma was of their own design and, therefore, the variance request was for a "self-created" hardship.

Mr. Aucamp advised that the canopy trees should be placed no closer than 25-feet on center, and that an accent tree could be placed between the canopy trees in order to achieve a buffer; however, it was not his responsibility to determine whether or not the District would allow the variance.

Mr. Evans asked if the air conditioning units were to be moved to the front of the townhouses since it had not been shown on the plans. Mr. Khavanin responded affirmatively, stating that there had not been enough time to revise the plans; however, it was in the process.

Mr. Dell asked if future homeowners would have to go to the District individually if they wanted to have some kind of planting bed behind their patios. Councilmember Crowley responded that after they went before Council, if they wanted to plant anything within the easement, they would have to go before the District. He added that permanent structures and landscaping would require a variance.

Councilmember Crowley advised that the District did not look favorably on variances and assumptions should not be made regarding their approval. He stated that the District preferred reviewing variance requests prior to them being submitted to Council so that Council would be clear on the item. When asked by Mr. Aucamp, "where could they put these trees"; Councilmember Crowley indicated that it was not uncommon for the District to grant a five-foot reduction in the 20-foot easement as the 20-foot easement was more "severe" than most water management districts required. Mr. Aucamp agreed that if the variance was granted, the landscaping would work. He acknowledged that the large Oak and Cypress trees would have to be "field adjusted" and recommended that they be placed between the buildings. After some discussion, Mr. Aucamp made several recommendations for the landscaping and showed the other Committee members the design and how it would affect the privacy of the units. Mr. Evans and Mr. Aucamp agreed that the landscape plan needed to come back for review once all the recommendations for installation and materials had been indicated on the plans.

Ms. Nolan explained the burden that was being placed on the staff regarding the numerous recommendations for changes to this project. She suggested that the Committee grant the petitioner a reasonable amount of time to complete the changes and that it review the revisions that had been recommended once they had been accomplished. Discussions continued regarding how to proceed with this item. The result was that a motion would be made to table and that a list of changes would be given to the petitioner to be accomplished for the next meeting.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**  
**MARCH 21, 2006**

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to table to April 11, 2006. Listed were the items to be addressed by the petitioner for that meeting: 1) revise/update all plans and be sure that they matched; 2) adjust the dead end turn-around to meet fire setbacks and increase the area so that all vehicles would be able to turn around; 3) landscaping must be behind the units around the pond; 4) on the two-story end units, add some kind of box-out, change in the roof line, and coordinate window placement; 5) change the vernacular; 6) patios have to be an eight-foot minimum; 7) look at all side entry driveways to make sure that they do work; and 8) label roads. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – absent; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

**4. OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business discussed.

**5. NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business discussed.

**6. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS**

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair/Committee Member